The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Certain Forms of the Greek Dialects

Carl Darling Buck

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 05 / June 1905, pp 242 - 250

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992709, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992709

How to cite this article:

Carl Darling Buck (1905). Notes on Certain Forms of the Greek Dialects. The Classical Review, 19, pp 242-250 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992709

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON CERTAIN FORMS OF THE GREEK DIALECTS.

- 1.—LESBIAN εἴκοιστος = εἰκοστός.
- 2.—ARGOLIC ἀλιάσσιος, στεγάσσιος, etc.
- 3.—THE ELEAN ACCUSATIVE PLURALS IN -αις, -αιρ, -οιρ.
- 4.—ARCADIAN διακωλύσει, AN ALLEGED AORIST OPTATIVE.
- 5.—CRETAN ἄτι = ἄτινα.
- 6.—THE ORIGIN AND DIALECTIC SCOPE OF DATIVES LIKE πόδεσσι.

1.—LESBIAN εἴκοιστος = εἰκοστός.

The inscription from Mytilene published for the first time in *I.G. XII. ii. 82*,¹ adds materially to our knowledge of the Lesbian numerals. It contains the ordinals from 13th to 23rd, each followed by χρ. and numeral signs denoting the amount. Of these latter the only one of interest is the sign for 100, namely E, not H which is otherwise universal even in the dialects in which the spiritus asper had long ceased to be pronounced (e.g. East Ion. ἐκατόν but H). The ordinals from 13th to 19th, e.g. ἐπτακαίδέκοτος, show the formation which is unknown in Attic inscriptions until very late (Meisterhans-Schwyzler, p. 163), but is found in Herodotus and in East Ionic inscriptions (Schweizer, *Grammatik d. pergamen. Inschr.* p. 165), and also in Boeotian, e.g. τρισκηδέκατον, πετταρεςκηδέκατον, etc. (*B.C.H.* xxi. 553 ff.). For 21st, etc. the system is the same as in Attic, namely εἰσκαικεικοστός, but δεύτερος καὶ εἰκοιστός, etc. (so also in Boeotian, e.g., ἔνα [κῆ] Φικαστόν, δὲν[τέρον κῆ Φικα]στόν, etc., l.c.).

Unfortunately the first part of the ordinal 13th has to be supplied, and it is uncertain whether to read with the editor τρισ[καιδέκοτος] or τρησ[καιδέκοτος]. The former gains no support from τρισκαίδεκα of No. 14, which is accusative, but is possible in view of nom. pl. πόλις (i.e. πόλεις) of No. 1 and the use of the accusative for the nominative elsewhere (e.g. Heracl. τρεῖς nom. and acc.). The latter would contain the proper nominative form, the phonetic equivalent of Attic τρεῖς, and τρης is actually cited as Aeolic by Choeroboscus (cf. Hoffmann, *Gr. Dial.* ii. p. 542), though not yet met with in inscriptions. The τρεῖς occurring several times is of course the κοινή form.

The ordinal 14th, whether we read with the editor πεσ[υρεσκαιδέκοτος] (Hesych. πέσυρες, Balbilla πέσυρα) or πωσ[υρεσκαιδέκοτος] (Hom. πίνυρες, etc.), is the first trace on inscriptions of the true dialect form for 'four,' τέσσαρα, etc. being κοινή forms.

Similarly πεμ[π]καιδέκοτος is the first inscriptional example of πέμπε, quoted as Aeolic by Hesychius and confirmed by Thess. δεκάπεμπε.

The ὀκτό of ὀκτοκαίδέκοτος, standing in the same relation to ὀκτώ as δύο to δύο, was previously known only in Boeotian.

All the forms thus far cited confirm the δέκοτος of Balbilla (cf. also Arc. δέκοτος).

But the most interesting form is εἴκοιστος, which occurs four times and confirms Kiepert's reading of εἰκοίσται in No. 639, which had not been credited (corrected to εἰκόσται by Bechtel; Hoffmann εἰκίσται; Hicks εἰκυῖσται; Meister in SGDI., after Blass, ε[κ]κ[λη]σ[τ]αι). What is the explanation of the oi? The only comment which I have seen is that of Solmsen, *Rh. M.* lviii. p. 614, footnote, who says 'Diese Form [εἴκοιστος] . . . bildet einen neuen, grade für das kleinasiatische Aeolisch sehr werthvollen Beleg für die Entwicklung von i aus σ vor Consonant; man halte dazu das neugefundene böotische αῖσtea = ἄσtea und sehe die Bemerkung von Danielsson *Idg. Forsch.* xiv. 378 f. Anm. 2 ein. Zu einer Aenderung der bei Brugmann *Gr. Gr.* 74 f. codificierten Lehre von den lautgeschichtlichen Schicksalen von ν vor σ + Consonant giebt die neue Form, wie mir scheint, keinen Anlass.' I do not believe that this is an adequate explanation. The examples of the phenomenon referred to, for which see especially G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.* 3 p. 176 and Danielsson, *Eranos*, i. p. 82 ff., are all, like the Boeot. αῖσtea, of sporadic occurrence. The physiological explanation is indeed simple enough. The position of the organs of speech in pronouncing an s is nearer to the i-position than to that of any other vowel. In passing from a vowel more open than i to an s, the speech-organs pass through the i-position, and if the transition is slow and the vibration of the vocal chords is kept up until the tongue is completely in the s-position, an i is distinctly audible, as may be tested by experiment. That this should occur only before σ + consonant is of course due to the fact that in this case σ was in the same syllable as the preceding vowel.

¹ The new numbering of the volumes of the Greek Corpus is followed throughout this paper.

But the fact remains that such a pronunciation was only occasional, or, to put it in another way, the *i* was so evanescent that it rarely was felt enough to affect the spelling. Out of the hundreds of words containing such combinations as *αστ*, *ασκ*, *αζ* (i.e. *azd*), *οστ*, *οζ*, etc., there are hardly more than half a dozen, from all dialects and periods, in which the diphthong is known, and in these only as the abnormal spelling, sometimes purely ephemeral, sometimes showing more or less persistency. In the latter case one may be certain that some other factor has contributed to this result. For *παλαιστή*, which, though *παλαστή* is the only form found on inscriptions, was a common enough spelling to elicit the reproval of Phrynichus, (Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 356), and to find its way into our texts, the obvious influence of *παλαίω*, *παλαιστής*, etc. has already been pointed out; similarly, the influence of *γεραῖος* in the case of *Γεραιστός* beside *Γεραστός* (Riemann, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* iii. 497). *Τροιζήνιοι*, which does not appear in inscriptions until imperial times for the earlier *Τροζάνιοι*, *Τροζήνιοι*, perhaps owes its further vogue to a fanciful resemblance to *Τροία*.¹

Αἰσκαπίος beside *Ἀσκαπίος* is a rare spelling, though the *Αἰσχλαβιοῖ*, quoted by G. Meyer, *l.c.* is now supplemented by three other examples of *Αἰσ-*, one from Troizene (*I.G.* iv. 771) and two from Epidaurus (*I.G.* iv. 1202, 1203). That this spelling was the one adopted in Latin (*Aesculapius*, early *Aiscclapi*) is quite likely due to the influence of a group of words for 'god,' 'divine,' etc. which was widely current in Italy, e.g. Etruscan *aisar* 'deus,' Marrucinian *aisos* 'dis,' Oscan *aisusis* 'sacrificiis,' etc.²

The other examples that have been cited are *αἰζηνία* = *Ἀζηνία* quoted by Danielsson, *Eranos*, i. 82, from Hyper. Euxen. 28 where Blass supposes a simple error, and the recently found *αἰστέα* in a poetical inscription from Acraephiae, though not in the Boeotian dialect (*Bull. Corr. Hell.*, xxiv. 70, here read as *ᾠστέα*; for *αἰστέα* = *ᾠστέα*, see 'Atticist', *Rh. M.* lvii. 315, and Danielsson, *Eranos*, iv. 188). An exceptional case would be *αἰζήος* according to Danielsson's etymology (*De voce αἰζήος quaestio etymologica*), which for this reason, if for no other, seems to me more than doubtful.³

¹ Since writing this I find that the same suggestion has already been made by Hoffmann, *Gr. Dial.* iii. 427.

² This is probably what is suggested by Lattes in a work cited by G. Meyer *l.c.*, but inaccessible to me.

³ In Boeotian *Θιόφειστος* beside *Θιόφειστος* and

With such material as the preceding it does not seem to me reasonable to compare the Lesbian *εἰκοστος*, which was evidently the normal form of this dialect. At the least one would have to suppose that the spelling was supported by some analogical influence, and in that connexion I may mention that my own first notion in meeting the word was that it was formed after superlatives in *-ιστος*, the intimate relation of suffix in superlatives and ordinals being well known. But this idea speedily gave way before the impression that it could not well be accidental that a formation which is believed to go back to an earlier **-κονστος* (e.g. Brugmann, *Grd.* ii. p. 490) should appear as *-κοιστος* in the one Greek dialect in which *ονσ* regularly yields *οισ* (acc. pl. *-οις*, 3 pl. pres. *-οισι*, etc.). But there are chronological difficulties, and this is evidently what has led Solmsen to look elsewhere for an explanation. It is commonly assumed that in the ordinals from 30th-90th *-κοστος* in place of *-καστος* (cf. Skt. *trīṣattamas*) arose after the analogy of *-κοντα* in proethnic Greek, either directly, the vowel only being affected (cf. *ποιμέσι* for **ποιμάσι* after *ποιμέν-*), or through a **-κονστος*. See Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 215, *Grd.* ii. p. 490 (otherwise Hist. *Gr. Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 318, who regards *-κοστος* from **-κονστος*, **-κοντ-τος* as the normal formation). Its appearance in *εἰκοστος* is a later, dialectic, extension (cf. Boeot. *Φικαστός*), but whatever is said of its history of course applies to it in this form also, so that the fact that we are dealing with Lesb. *εἰκοστος* and not with a **τριάκοιστος* has no special bearing on the argument.

Θεσιπιεύς beside *Θεσιπιεύς*, which were formerly cited in the same connexion, the *ει*, as is now clear, represents not a diphthong but a close *ε*, the sound intermediate between *ε* and *ι* for which the sign *ι* is also used. This is in itself no bar to assuming connexion with the phenomenon in question. For that the evanescent *ι*, which with a preceding *α* or *ο* may produce the effect of a diphthong, should with a preceding *ε*, so near itself in quality, only make it somewhat closer, is just what we might expect from the relation of *θῆνω* (*θελνω*) from **θεῖνω* to *βαίνω* from **βαῖνω* (see Goidanich, *Le Sorti dei gruppi I.-E. -nj-, -mj-, -rj-, -lj- nell' Ellenismo*, p. 20 ff.). But whether the *ει* in these cases is actually due to the following *σ* + consonant is rendered somewhat uncertain by the fact that such an *ει* is also found in other combinations, e.g. *Ξεναπέτω*, *Κλισθεινός*, etc., indicating that a close pronunciation was characteristic of the Boeotian *ει* in general. See Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 28; Meister, *Ber. sächs. Gesell.* 1899, p. 146; Sadée, *De Boeotiae titulorum dialecto* p. 80. *Θεσιπιεύς*, which is the regular spelling in inscriptions of Thespieae, is thought by Dittenberger to be a case of original *η*. See Sadée, *l.c.*

The current doctrine as to the treatment of the combination $\nu + \sigma + \text{cons.}$, I am no more disposed to question than is Solmsen (see above), and admit at once that, even if we adopt the second of the alternatives mentioned, this proethnic $^{*}\text{-}\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, would become $-\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, and could not be used in connexion with the specifically Lesbian change of $\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ to $\omicron\iota\sigma$. But there are still two possibilities. One is that the analogical form is not proethnic, but arose independently in the several dialects. The possibility of this no one can deny in view of well-known instances where a form is shared by related dialects but cannot have arisen in the predialectic period. But the view which seems to me more probable is that, assuming a proethnic $-\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ after $-\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$ (whether or not through $-\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$), the analogy of $-\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$ made itself felt anew in prehistoric Lesbian giving rise to a new $-\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, which then underwent the regular Lesbian change of $\nu\sigma$, yielding $-\kappa\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The relation of this to the $-\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ seen elsewhere would be parallel to that of Attic gen. sg. $-\omicron\upsilon$ in masc. $\tilde{a}$ -stems to $-\tilde{a}\omicron$, $-\epsilon\omega$ of other dialects (Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³).

That this view cannot recommend itself for its simplicity I am well aware. But it has the merit of accounting for the existence of the form in Lesbian and Lesbian only.

2.—ARGOLIC ἀλιάσσιος, στεγάσσιος, ETC.

The material upon which previous discussions have been based consists of the following Argolic forms: Argive ἀλιάσσιος *I.G.* iv. (*Ins. Argolidis*) 554, Epidaurian στεγάσσιος *I.G.* iv. 1485, Troizenian ἀποστεγάσσιος, ἐρμάσσιος, ἱμασιάν *I.G.* iv. 823. To these is to be added Boeotian ἀγόρασσιν *Rev. Ét. Grec.* xii. p. 69 ff.

The Argolic forms were first thought to be simply examples of that secondary doubling of consonants which appears sporadically in various quarters and has to do with the matter of syllabification (see Solmsen, *Untersuch. z. griech. Laut- und Verslehre*, p. 162 ff.). So Fröhner, *Rev. Arch.* 1891, p. 54; Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 543. But this view took no account of the fact that the forms in question are all, except the obscure ἱμασιάν, from $-\alpha\zeta\omega$ verbs, while other nouns in $-\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the same inscriptions show only one σ , e.g. καταθέσιος, θέσιος, ἀναγρέσιος, ἀποφορήσιος, etc.

The $\sigma\sigma$ has also been attributed to the influence of the aorist of $-\alpha\zeta\omega$ verbs, e.g. Epid. ἐργάσσασθαι, just as the ξ in Locr.

ψάφεις, Cret. ἀπ]ολαγάξιος, etc. (cf. also Epid. στεγάξιος in the same inscription with στεγάσσιος) is connected with the ξ of the aorist which in so many dialects is extended from guttural to dental stems (Thess. ψαφί-ξασθην, etc.). So von Friesen, *Über den argaischen Dialekt*, in the *Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet förhandlingar*, 1894-1897, p. 146. This explanation answered for the Argolic forms, the only ones then known, but is out of the question for Boeot. ἀγόρασσιν, since in Boeotian the aorist of dental stems has regularly $\tau\tau$, not $\sigma\sigma$, e.g. ἀπολογίττασθῃ in the same inscription with ἀγόρασσιν.

According to Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 66, the $\sigma\sigma$ is to be assumed as once existing in all such derivatives of $-\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ and $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ verbs. That is, to στεγάζω was formed $^{*}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, parallel to στεγαστός, etc., whence στέγασσις, later στέγασις. In assuming this development he abandons the generally accepted view that τ when preceded by σ is entirely exempt from the change to σ (*Gr. Gram.*² p. 57, Kretschmer *K.Z.* xxx. p. 565), and sees another example of the same change in the Lesbian ἐσσι (Hoffmann, *Gr. Dial.* ii. No. 135) which he takes to be a third singular from ἐσσι. But the usual form in Lesbian is ἐστί as everywhere else, and this ἐσσι, if not simply an error (so G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*³ 567), is more plausibly explained as a third plural with Hoffmann, *l.c.* p. 475. Certainly all other evidence is in favour of the earlier view, and I am not ready to believe that the preservation of τ in ἐστί in contrast to τίθησι, and in πίστις, πύστις, etc., has nothing to do with the preceding σ .

My notion of the history of these nouns in $-\sigma\iota\varsigma$ beside verbs in $-\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, is that they are not actually formed from the dental stems seen in the latter, but have rather adopted their type from words the formation of which antedates the notoriously secondary extension of dental stems in Greek. Thus κτίσις is certainly κτί-σις from κτί-τις (Skt. *kṣi-ti-s*, Av. *si-ti-š*) and has never passed through any such stages as $^{*}\kappa\tau\iota\delta$ -τις, $^{*}\kappa\tau\iota\sigma$ -τις with the secondary dental stem which appears in κτίζω, κτίστης, κτίσμα, etc. Cf. κλί-μα, κλί-σις, etc. from κλι- (ἐκλίθην, κέκλιμαι), not from the secondary κλιν- (ἐκλίνθην, ἐκλίνα) like κλιντήρ. After the relation of such a form as κτίσις to κτίζω would be formed ψάφισις to ψάφίζω (or $^{*}\psi\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$ after $^{*}\kappa\tau\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$ if one prefers to go further back), etc. Similarly δάμασις ($^{*}\delta\alpha\mu\alpha$ -τις) does not contain the dental seen in δαμάζω any more than does ἐδάμα-σ(σ)α,

Cret. δαμάσαιτο.¹ Cf. also, from dissyllabic root forms in -α, χάλα-σις (cf. χάλα-ρός), κρέμα-σις, κατα-κέρα-σις, σκεδα-σις, δύνα-σις (cf. δύνα-τός, δυνά-της), beside derivatives with secondary σ (Solmsen, *K.Z.* 29, 111 ff.) such as κρεμαστός, κέρασμα, σκεδαστός, δυνάστης. After the analogy of a form of this kind, come to be associated with a form with secondary dental, e.g. after δάμασις beside δαμάζω, was formed στέγασις to στεγάζω, ἀγοράσις to ἀγοράζω, etc., where of course there is no inherited root form in -α. A parallel case, I believe, is ἐργάτης, for which I find no explanation suggested anywhere. It is obviously an early formation for which the apparently normal ἐργαστής is only a very late substitute.

I have tried to show that there is no necessity of deriving a form like στέγασις from an earlier *στέγαστις and so assuming a change of τι to σι after σ. But it is not unnatural that the σ which appears before other suffixes in derivatives of dental stems and is even extended from these and from σ-stems to vowel stems (see above) should sooner or later appear also before -σις. And this is what I assume to be the case in Epid. στεγάσσιος, Boeot. ἀγορασσιν, etc., namely that the first σ is due to the analogy of στεγαστός, στέγασμα, ἀγοραστής, ἀγοράσμα, etc. The relation of στέγασσις to στέγασις is then the same as that between ἐργάσσις and ἐργάτης, δυνάσσις and δυνάτης, κτίσσις and κτίτης. It would not be inconsistent with my view to assume that this took place in the predialectic period, only after the change of τι to σι. But so long as the evidence of σσ is confined to two dialects I prefer to regard it as a later dialectic phenomenon. Observe also that in *I.G.* iv. 823 ἐργασίας occurs five times, never with σσ in spite of ἀποστεγάσσις, etc. Apparently the σσ had come into the -σις nouns but not to those in -σια. But for the precise scope of these -σσ forms we must await further evidence.

3.—THE ELEAN ACCUSATIVE PLURALS IN -αις, -αιρ, -οιρ.

There is still no general agreement as to whether the Elean accusatives in -αις, -αιρ, -οιρ are real accusatives in origin, like Lesbian -αις, -οις from -avs, -ovs, or

¹ Schulze, *K.Z.* 33, 126 ff. In this connexion note that Hom., Lesb. ἐκάλε-σσα for ἐκάλε-σα after ἐτέλεσ-σα is now found in Boeotian also (συνκαλέσαντες in the same inscription which contains ἀγορασσιν; see reference above), another example of the Aeolic constituent in Boeotian.

dative forms used as accusatives. On the whole the latter view seems to be more widely held at present. First asserted by Wilamowitz, *Zeitschrift für d. Gymnasialwesen*, 1877, p. 649, it was adopted by Solmsen, *K.Z.* 29, p. 34 ff., and by Dittenberger, *Inscriptionen von Olympia*, p. 6. The forms of the new amnesty decree are accented as datives by most of its editors, namely Szanto, *Jahreshefte d. oesterr. archäol. Instituts*, i. p. 197 ff., Meister, *Sitzungsber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1898, p. 218 ff. (in contrast to his treatment in his *Griech. Dialekte*), and by Danielsson, *Eranos* iii. p. 129 ff., who however says p. 132 'ταῖς γεναῖς (bzw. ταῖς γεναῖς)', thus leaving the question open. Keil, *Gött. Nachr.* 1899, p. 136 ff. accents ταῖρ γεναῖρ, but only to show that they are used as accusatives. He says (p. 153): 'Die Formen ταῖρ γεναῖρ habe ich als Accusative accentuiert, nicht als ob ich damit sagen wollte, dass sie das seien, sondern weil sie das bedeuten; und das anzudeuten, ist ja doch auch die Accentuation da, namentlich für uns heut. Ich sehe keine Möglichkeit zu entscheiden, ob es katachrestisch verwendete Dative oder in äolischen Art gebildete Accusative sind; denn das letztere ist nicht ausgeschlossen.' Keil then goes on to suggest, apropos of the early forms in -Ος and -Ας, that the pronunciation may have been -o^{ns} and -a^{ns}, the weak nasal of which was not expressed in writing but nevertheless affected the pronunciation of the preceding vowels, until -οις and -αις were plainly heard and expressed in writing. That the early forms in -Ος, -Ας and *-ΟΙς,² -ΑΙς represent simply different spellings of the same sound is entirely in line with the orthographical inconsistencies of early Elean, and is altogether more probable than that they represent sentence doublets according to the well known theory of Osthoff, *Geschichte d. Perfekts*, p. 26 ff. Only, since the diphthongal spelling is as early as the other, I should prefer to assume as the pronunciation thus variously represented, -o^{ns}, -a^{ns}, with

² -ΑΙς occurs in *Inscr. v. Ol.* Nos. 2, 3, which Dittenberger (p. 4) regards as somewhat earlier than Nos. 4, 5, which have -Ας. I have no hesitation in assuming -ΟΙς beside -ΑΙς for the early period. Dittenberger's statement (p. 6) 'Erst in dieser (i.e. the Democrates bronze of the first half of the third century) erstreckt sie (the diphthongal formation) auf die o-stämme der zweiten Deklination' is verbally accurate, but gives a wrong impression of what the facts show. For it must be noted that there are no occurrences of o-stem accusatives in those inscriptions which have -ΑΙς not -Ας. There is then not the slightest ground for assuming that the conditions were different in the two declensions.

incipient diphthongs, which later became fully developed diphthongs. The existence of the double spelling in the accusatives explains the occasional appearance of -Ος in datives, as in *Insch. v. Ol.* Nos. 10, 11, which Dittenberger (p. 27) attributes to syntactical confusion. Against the assumption of a phonetic development of -ovs, -avs like the Lesbian has been urged the fact that Elean has *πάσα* not *παῖσα* like the Lesbian, and that everywhere the history of secondary intervocalic *vs* as in *πάνσα* and that of final *vs* as in *τάνς* run parallel. But what is a parallel development in most dialects need not be such in all (e.g. Ion., etc. *θάλασσα*, *μέσσος*, Boeot., etc. *θάλαττα*, *μέττος*, but Att. *θάλαττα*, *μέσος*), and, while breaks in a parallelism hitherto regarded as complete may occasion some surprise, we must be prepared to accept them, as nearly every important addition to our dialectic material makes the more evident.

I can see then no cogent objection to regarding the Elean forms as genuine accusatives, and fail utterly to understand how anyone who holds this view can, as does Keil himself, regard as equally credible the idea of syntactical confusion with the dative, in support of which nothing adequate has ever been adduced. To be sure Wilamowitz referred to the conditions in the first declension in Modern Greek as parallel (wie denn bekanntlich das Neugriechische genau dieselbe Erscheinung in der ersten Declination, nur entsprechend fortgebildet, zeigt), but he would surely withdraw this now that the true history of the nom.-acc. forms in -ες (commonly spelled -αις) is understood (Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, p. 138 ff.). As to the use in Elean and elsewhere of nominatives in -ες (-εϛ) as accusatives, to which Wilamowitz also refers, confusion between nominative and accusative is on quite a different footing, owing to the fact that the forms are the same in the neuter, and moreover has in this instance a more specific explanation, as shown by Wackernagel *I.F.* xiv. p. 368. Dittenberger, *l.c.*, alludes to a general breaking down of the feeling for case distinctions in the Roman period, referring to his note to *I.G.* vii. 1713 apropos of the confusion of dative and genitive after *ἐπί*. But the phenomena of case confusion in this late period, for which cf. especially Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, p. 149 ff., are in part the result of phonetic processes characteristic of this period, and, even where mainly syntactical, as in the general-

ization of the accusative with prepositions, offer no parallel for a substitution of dative for accusative.

Above all no one has even raised the question why the alleged confusion of dative and accusative in Elean is unknown in the singular, or in the plural of the third declension. If it were a purely syntactical phenomenon, a general confusion of the two cases, we should certainly expect to find some traces of it in these forms.

4.—ARCADIAN διακωλύσει, AN ALLEGED AORIST OPTATIVE.

Arcadian διακωλύσει, which occurs in a conditional clause co-ordinately with an optative φθέραι, is generally taken as an optative, although there is no other evidence of the existence of such an optative form in Greek. The sentence, from the Tegean building-contract SGDI. 1222 = Hoffmann i. No. 30, reads as follows: *εἰ δὲ πόλεμος διακωλύσει τι τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐσδοθέντων, ἢ τῶν ἡργασμένων τι φθέραι, οἱ τριακάσιοι διαγνόντω τί δεῖ γίνεσθαι*. Of the earlier commentators on this inscription, Bergk (cf. *Kl. Schriften*, ii. p. 337) took διακωλύσει as future indicative, and remarked 'neque offensioni erit diversos modos consociari, plane sic est in titulo Teio,' quoting then a passage from the Teian Curse (Hoffmann ii. No. 105), which however owing to the condition of the text, is best left out of account. But other scholars, from Michaelis, *Jhb.* 1861, p. 395, on, have assumed that the form is optative, e.g. Curtius, *Verbum* ii.² 293, Brugmann, *M. U.* iii. p. 66, Meister, *Gr. Dial.* ii. p. 112, G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 662, Kühner-Blass, ii. p. 74, Wackernagel, *Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 46. Hoffmann alone of recent writers has regarded with favour the idea of a shift in mood. Cf. *Gr. Dial.* i. p. 261 'Indessen kann διακωλύσει (nach εἰ) auch als Indikativ des Futurs gedeutet werden, da ein Wechsel des Modus nichts Anstössiges bietet.' It seems to me that an interchange of moods is not only possible here, but far less surprising than would be an interchange, within the same sentence of a prose inscription, of two such different formations as -σει and -σαι, even if the former were a well known variant of -σειε. And when it becomes necessary to assume a formation which is not otherwise attested, the chances of our having to do with different formations rather than with different moods drop to about zero.

I cannot put my hand on an example of such shifting from indicative to optative in

literary Greek, and it is possible that one might search long without finding one. But if so, I should attribute this to an artificial regularity, such as is sometimes to be observed in the literary language, and from which the dialect inscriptions are comparatively free. For there is nothing really anomalous in such a change. It would occasion no comment if one should say in English 'If war *interrupts* (present in future sense) the work contracted for or *should* (even) *destroy* what was already completed.'

5.—CRETAN $\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota = \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\upsilon\alpha$.

Cretan $\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota = \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\upsilon\alpha$ (*Gortynian Law-Code*, iv. 32, etc.) was first regarded as a form with second element undeclined, but to this view has generally been preferred the explanation of Solmsen, *Bz.B.* xviii. p. 145 f., according to which it contains $\tau\iota$, an isolated relic of the accusative plural neuter in $-\tilde{\iota}$ such as is found in Sanskrit and elsewhere, but for which in Greek we find otherwise only $-\iota\alpha$, $-\iota\alpha$ ($\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ from $*\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha$). So, though somewhat doubtfully, G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 465, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 235, Kurze, *Vergl. Gram.* p. 394. Still otherwise, but most improbably, J. Schmidt, *Sonantentheorie*, p. 24 ftn.

Apart from any scepticism of the survival in this one form of $-\tilde{\iota}$ beside $-\iota\alpha$, which as I believe with others is not a Greek analogical substitution for $-\tilde{\iota}$ but an inherited by-form, this explanation must definitely yield to the older view of an undeclined $-\tau\iota$, as soon as we are convinced of the existence of a genitive singular in $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota$ such as is assumed by Blass in his edition of the Cretan inscriptions in SGDI. In the Law-Code, ii. 48 ff. we read $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \kappa\alpha\rho\tau\omicron \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\nu, \alpha\tilde{\iota} \kappa' \acute{\epsilon}\iota \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \acute{\phi}\omicron\nu \alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\nu, \kappa\omicron\tau\iota \kappa' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu [\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha]\nu \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota \kappa' \acute{\epsilon}\iota, \kappa\tau\lambda. \kappa\omicron\tau\iota$ l. 50, which has generally been taken as = $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\omega}\tau\iota$, Blass interprets as = $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\omega}\tau\iota$, i.e. $\kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\delta\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$. If the accusative $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota$ is not impossible, it is nevertheless true that the genitive by attraction gives us a more normal syntax. Blass also reads genitive singular $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota$ ($\acute{\omega}\tau\iota$) in i. 5, but as to the advantage of this over $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ I am not clear.

The objection which Solmsen raised to the view here preferred was the unlikelihood of there being still a third type of inflection in addition to the two which were already known elsewhere and actually found in the Law-Code itself, e.g. $\omicron\delta\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ with both parts declined, and $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota\mu\iota$, $\acute{\delta}\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with only the second part declined.

And it must be admitted that the existence of three types through the whole paradigm would be surprising. But just as we see the two well known types partially differentiated in various dialects, e.g. in the Attic inscriptions gen. sg. m. or n. $\acute{\delta}\tau\omicron\nu$ never $\omicron\delta\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, but gen. sg. f. $\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (see Meisterhans-Schwyzler, p. 156), so we may surmise that the third type was used only in certain forms. So long as so few of the case-forms are quotable from early Cretan, any suggestion along this line must be purely tentative, yet I venture to offer one, namely that the forms in $-\tau\iota$ were used only in the neuter, thus effecting a distinction from the masculine forms, which in certain cases, as the genitive singular, was not effected by the mere inflection of the first part. Note the various ways of distinguishing the feminine from the masculine, which again would in the [genitive singular, etc. not be effected by the ordinary inflection of the second element, e.g. in Attic by inflection of the first element ($\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\delta}\tau\omicron\nu$ being thus reserved for the masculine or neuter), but in Cretan by the substitution of a feminine (adjectival) form for the second member ($\acute{\delta}\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, etc.).

6.—THE ORIGIN AND DIALECTIC SCOPE OF DATIVES LIKE $\pi\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$.

The old explanation of datives like $\pi\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, as representing an extension of $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ from $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, etc., has survived more than one attack even in recent years, but many will conclude that it has at last received its death blow at the hands of Wackernagel in *Idg. Forsch.* xiv. p. 373 ff. For this eminent scholar's contributions are so justly regarded as models of minutest learning and acute linguistic method that there is perhaps danger that his conclusion in this matter will be accepted too lightly. Yet it is only common courtesy to an explanation which has served us so long and faithfully, to make doubly certain that it is doomed before consigning it to the rubbish heap. And let us observe at the outset that no satisfactory successor has yet been found. For, not to mention earlier and impossible theories, Wackernagel's suggestion that after the analogy of the relation of the dative to the nominative plural in the first and second declensions arose the dative $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ beside the nominative $-\epsilon\varsigma$ ($-\alpha\iota$, $-\omicron\iota$: $-\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$, $-\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ = $-\epsilon\varsigma$: $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$) seems to me at least to lack the element of probability. At all events everyone will agree,

I think, that the older explanation is simpler and more attractive on the face of it, so that the question comes back to the cogency of the objections which are believed to make its acceptance impossible. Blass, in Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gram.* i. p. 418, after some remarks on the lack of proof (and why may not the chronological steps in the development for which he demands historical evidence have been completed in prehistoric times in Aeolic?), makes the point that the σ -stems are not numerous enough to make probable such a far reaching extension of their ending, and moreover are mostly neuters. But how often has attention been called to the fact that, while, other things being equal, the numerical strength of a formation adds to its power of affecting others, even the smallest number of forms, less than half a dozen for example, has sometimes been sufficient to impose their type, which for one reason or another met with favour, upon hundreds of others. And the number of σ -stems is assuredly not so excessively small. As to their being neuters, their first extension may have been to neuters like $\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha$, without necessarily stopping there. But see below. Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridion dictionis epicae*, p. 209 f., ridicules the notion that $\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ is formed after $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ and then reacted on the latter giving rise to $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\iota$, and considers it fortunate that there did not spring up even longer and worse forms such as $\pi\acute{o}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\iota$ or even $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\iota$. Passing from joking to seriousness (so he says), he makes the following remarkable comment: 'Nempe labis tam late gliscentis ipsosque nervos linguae afficientis nullum exemplum in lingua HomERICA extat.' He cannot believe that the poets used their language so faultily, especially as the forms in $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ are neither rare nor confined to unusual words or proper names, nor demanded by the metre. He concludes therefore that the explanation in question should be consigned to oblivion as soon as possible ('quam primum oblivione est premenda'). I have cited this criticism at perhaps unnecessary length, for it is of course quite impossible to argue with one who is still in the bonds of that notion which the unfortunate term 'false analogy' (*pravum analogiae studium*) fostered, that the force of analogy is something abnormal and depraved, instead of one of the fundamental linguistic factors. Anyone who can derive so much amusement from the suggestion of analogy in $\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\iota$ might easily become

hysterical over some of the best attested phenomena of modern languages.

We come now to the more serious strictures of Wackernagel, which are briefly as follows. Firstly, there is no opportunity for proportional analogy. ' $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\sigma\iota$ zu $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\iota$ nach $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\iota\sigma\iota$: $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\iota$ versteht jeder; $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ zu $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\iota$ nach $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\iota$ ist unbegreiflich.' Secondly, while inflectional endings are also transferred without the help of proportional analogy, provided the words are construed together or are associated in meaning, there is no special bond of association between $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ and $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, etc. 'Es darf hier auch betont werden, dass sich die neutralen Stämme durchaus nicht durch Gebrauch der Endung $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ auszeichnen. Im Gegenteil. Thessalisch ist $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ nur in Maskulinum und Femininum belegt; die einzige Neutralform (*Inscr. von Kierion*, Z. 4) lautet $\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$. Daneben allerdings $\delta\pi\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ und $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ bei Sappho, $\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ in den delphischen Labyadeninschrift usw.'

As to the Thessalian $\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, it lacks $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ not because it is a neuter but because the inscription of Cierium is in the dialect of the Thessaliotis, not in that of the Pelasgiotis. It is only one of several peculiarities of this inscription as compared with those of the Pelasgiotis, differences which were at once pointed out by Meister and by Danielsson in their respective commentaries, but which have been treated most luminously in their broader relations by Solmsen in his article 'Pelasgiotis und Thessaliotis,' *Rh. M.* 58, p. 528 ff.

So far as I can see, there is nothing in the facts at hand to either prove or disprove the assumption that the neuters were the first to adopt $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, whence it was extended later, but still in prehistoric times (in Aeolic), to masculines and feminines. If we start from substantive σ -stems, leaving the adjective σ -stems out of account, such an assumption is a likely one, but even then not a necessary one. For it must be seriously doubted whether Wackernagel is right in implying that an extension of inflectional endings can take place only through the medium of proportional analogy, or else (aside from the interchange of nominal and pronominal inflection, etc.) within the limits of congeneric groups. It is true of course that the more circumscribed the group of words and the more intimate the psychological association between its members, the greater will be the tendency to analogical influence within it. Yet we cannot lay down narrow limits as

to the degree of psychological association which is prerequisite to the operation of analogy. All members of a given syntactical category, for example all dative plurals, form eo ipso a psychological group, large indeed, but not so large that it may not be pervaded by the force of analogy. We may assume theoretically, if we like, that the analogy works within smaller groups at first, spreading from group to group within the larger group. But the progress may be so rapid as to leave no more trace historically of such stages than do the hypothetically assumed intermediate stages in a phonetic development. There is no reason to doubt the existence of purely functional analogy, or, to use Wundt's term, external grammatical analogy, not confined within limits narrower than that of the syntactical category itself and not due to a specific proportional analogy. It is altogether improbable, for example, that proportional analogy has had anything to do with the extension in English of the genitive ending *s*, or of the plural *s*, or of the preterite *-ed*. Nor do I believe, to return to Wackernagel's argument, that the agreement of *ἄγών* and *λόγος* in the genitive plural was an essential factor in the creation of the N.W. Greek *ἄγώνους*, though it is commonly so stated. That we have *ἄγώνους*, but not also *ἄγώνου*, *ἄγώνους*, is of course due to the fact that the dative is the one case of the plural in which the stem, if ending in a mute or nasal, was not kept intact. A uniform stem form is not essential, but the tendency in favour of it is notorious. A new formation, from whatever source, which presented the same form of stem as the other cases, would be the more likely to win its way. In the N.W. Greek dialects the *-ους* form supplied the want; in the Aeolic dialects, whence its appearance in Homer, the *-εσσι* of *o*-stems. Why not? *-εσσι* is just as much the apparent ending of *o*-stems as is *-ους* of *o*-stems. That vague but real thing which we call linguistic sense analyzes forms in various ways according to the momentary point of view. Such a form as *ἔπεσσι* may be felt as *ἔπεσσι* from the point of view of the other datives in *-σι*, as *ἔπεσσι* from the point of view of *ἔπε-ος*, *ἔπε-α*, *ἔπέ-ων*, etc., or as *ἔπ-εσσι* from the point of view of what is the only invariable element in all the case-forms, namely, *ἔπ-*. The extension of this *-εσσι* is precisely parallel to what is so often seen in the history of suffixes, e.g. Lat. *ur-bānus* after *Rōmānus*. It was first employed in consonant stems, where it was preferred to the older forms in which the stem was

not kept intact (*πόδεσσι* in place of *ποσσί*), and thence extended to vowel stems as in *πολίεσσι*. It was of course these latter forms, in their relation to *πόλιος*, *πολίων*, etc., which reacted on *ἔπεσσι*, leading to the epic *ἐπέεσσι* beside *ἔπεος*, *ἔπέων*, etc.

I have spoken of forms like *πόδεσσι* as arising in Aeolic, and it is an undoubted fact that they are primarily characteristic of the Aeolic dialects, and that, as far as their appearance in the Epic is concerned, they are to be reckoned among the Aeolic elements, for they are unknown in Ionic. But it is commonly believed that Aeolic is not the only home of this formation. It is recognized as Doric and N.W. Greek by Ahrens, *De dial. dorica*, p. 229, Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gram.* i. p. 417, G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 473, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ p. 239. The facts are briefly as follows. *-εσσι* is the regular formation in the three Aeolic dialects, Lesbian, Thessalian (Pelasgiotis), and Boeotian. It is also Phocian; some examples have long been known, and since the discovery of the Labyadae inscription it is clear that this was the regular form of the dialect, though later replaced partially by *-ους* of the N.W.-Greek *κοινή* or *-σι* of the Attic *κοινή*. But there is no doubt that Phocis was Aeolic before the West Greek migrations, and while there was no such residue of Aeolic elements as in Boeotia, there are still some probable traces of it. See especially Solmsen, *K.Z.* xxxiv. p. 554 ff., xxxviii. p. 213 ff. To these might be reckoned the forms in *-εσσι*. But Keil, *Hermes* xxxi. p. 516 note, thinks this unlikely, adding 'nachgerade haben wir Beispiele genug, um zu erkennen, dass *-εσσι* auch dor. alt und weit verbreitet war.' Similarly Solmsen, *K.Z.* xxxviii. p. 214. In the case of *-εσσι* in Eastern Locris there is the same possibility of its being an Aeolic relic. In Elean too, which usually has *-ους*, *-εσσι* is now quotable in *φρυγάδεσσι* of the amnesty decree, of which Keil, *Gött. Nachr.* 1899, p. 153, remarks 'Auf den ersten Blick scheint *φρυγάδεσσι* äol. zu sein; allein wir haben jetzt so viele solche dorische Bildungen dass man sein Urteil zurückhalten muss.'

In other words Keil, who is a believer in an Aeolic element in Elean, and Solmsen, who is a believer in an Aeolic element in Phocian, are both deterred from reckoning *-εσσι* among these elements by the belief that *-εσσι* is common to Doric¹ also. Yet

¹ That is, as throughout in this paper, Doric in the narrower (and, still, more usual) sense, exclusive of N.W. Greek or 'North Doric.'

it is surprising to find how restricted is the evidence to support such a statement as Keil's that '-εσσι auch dor. alt und weit verbreitet war,' or that of Blass (Kühner-Blass i. p. 417) that '-εσσι im Norden (Delphi, das östliche Lokris), sowie im Peloponnes und in den meisten westlichen Kolonien herrscht (italics mine), daher auch bei den italiotischen und sicilischen Schriftstellern.' I find just three examples from Doric inscriptions cited in the various works referred to above (Ahrens, G. Meyer, Kühner-Blass, etc.), namely Megarian λαγόνεσσιν, Syracusan ὑέεσσι, Corcyraean Ἀρμάτεσσι. Meg. λαγόνεσσιν (*I.G.* vii. 117) is from a metrical inscription of the *fourth or fifth century A.D.* in the ordinary Epic dialect, without a trace of Doric. Syrac. ὑέεσσι (*I.G.* xiv. 10) is from an inscription known only through early copies, and the reading of this particular word rests on an emendation of Scaliger. Blass in SGDI. 3235 reads (τ)έ(λε)σι or τέ(λ)εσσι, which suits the copy (ΤΕΕΣΣΙ Nicotius; see *I.G.* l.c.) and gives a better sense. The one example left is Corcyr. Ἀρμάτεσσι (*I.G.* ix. i. 694 = SGDI. 3206), the designation of some locality (the inscription has otherwise the usual formation, as χρήμασιν). But to this may now be added νομιζόντ[ε]σσι, νικών-τεσ[σι], [νικώ]τεσσι, from a decree of Epidamnus, Kern, *Inschriften von Magnesia*, no. 46; further Παιδεσσι, Παιδεσι, a name applied to certain female divinities in a series of inscriptions from Acrae, in Sicily, *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1899, p. 452 ff. = SGDI. 5256-9. Unless I have overlooked some other recent discovery, the inscriptional evidence for Doric -εσσι is confined to Corinthian colonies. The same is true of the literary evidence, which, except for πολέεσσι in Thucydides' text of the Spartan decree (v. 77) to which it is impossible to attach much importance, is entirely Syra-

cusan. -εσσι is found not only in Epicharmus and Sophron, but is also the prevailing form in the Doric prose of Archimedes, who seems to have followed pretty faithfully the Syracusan dialect of his time, a so-called Doric *κοινή*, in reality a mixture of Doric and Attic *κοινή*.

It is evident that the usual statements as to the prevalence of -εσσι in Doric are too broad, and that the only Doric dialect for which it is attested, according to our present evidence both inscriptional and literary, is that of Corinth as represented by the colonies. Now it is beyond question of course that the same process which led to -εσσι in Aeolic might have operated independently in Corinthian or any other dialect. Nevertheless I venture to suggest another possibility, namely that in the cases mentioned we have to do with a popular adoption of the Epic form. It is among the Corinthian colonies that we find the most numerous examples of the popular adaptation, in metrical inscriptions, of Epic to the native Doric, resulting in that sort of 'Doric Epic' of which the well known Menecrates epitaph of Corcyra and the Procleidas epitaph of Northern Acarnania (*I.G.* IX. i. 521) are typical. Why may not the Epic -εσσι have found its way even into the prose of everyday speech?

It is only fair to add that -εσσι is perhaps to be recognized in Pamphylian, which however is not a Doric dialect in the narrower sense and is still too little known to be precisely classified. In the latest discussion of the difficult inscription of Sillyon, Meister, *Ber. sächs. Gesell. Wiss.* 1904, p. 3 ff., reads [ἐπ]ὶ δ[ικ]αστ[έ]ρεσσ[ι], formerly taken as [κα]ὶ δ[ικ]αστ[έ]ρες.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
March, 1905.

DEMOSTHENES'S NICKNAME ἀργᾶς.

In Plutarch's *Demosthenes* we read (4. 5): 'Ὁ δὲ ἀργᾶς—καὶ τοῦτο γάρ φασι τῷ Δημοσθένει γενέσθαι παρωνύμιον—ἡ πρὸς τὸν τρόπον ὡς θηριώδη καὶ πικρὸν ἐτέθη· τὸν γὰρ ὄφιν ἔνιοι τῶν ποιητῶν ἀργᾶν ὀνομάζουσιν· ἡ πρὸς τὸν λόγον ὡς ἀνιώντα τοὺς ἀκρωμένους· καὶ γὰρ Ἀργᾶς τοῖνομα ποιητῆς ἦν νόμων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀργαλέων. Both these explanations of the nickname I believe to be wrong, and

I also believe that the right explanation is to be found in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, where we now read in v. 114 sq.—thanks to the acumen of Blomfield and Hartung—these words: οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλεῦσι νέων, ὁ κελαινὸς ὁ δ' ἐξόπιν ἀργαῖς, which description of the two eagles is equivalent to: ὁ μὲν μελάμπυγος ὁ δὲ πύγαργος. Now what more natural than that some witty—or